

United States Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management

Categorical Exclusion Not Established By Statute

DOI-BLM-UT-Y202-2016-003-CX

October 2015

Canyonlands Park Tours SRP

Location: San Juan County, UT

Applicant/Address: Canyonlands Park Tours
65 Circle Drive
P.O. Box 273
Monticello, UT 84535

U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management
Monticello Field Office
435 North Main
Monticello, Utah 84535
Phone: 435-587-1522
FAX: 435-587-1518



CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION NOT ESTABLISHED BY STATUTE

A. Background

BLM Office: Monticello Field Office

Proposed Action Title/Type: Interpretive Driving Tours and Short Hikes

Location of Proposed Action: San Juan County, UT

PROPOSED ACTION: Canyonlands Park Tours proposes to offer driving tours and short hikes to various developed sites on BLM lands in San Juan County, UT. Sites offered would include: Newspaper Rock, turn-outs along Highway 211, Mule Canyon Archeological Ruin, Butler Wash Archeological Ruin, and the Seven Kivas Archeological Ruin in Westwater Canyon. This permit would be issued as a one-year probationary permit with the option of a five-year renewal based on satisfactory compliance with terms and conditions.

Each tour would have up to eight participants, including seven customers and one guide. One van may be used per tour. The vehicle will remain on paved routes and parking areas at most times, but may access short spurs of Class B routes in the Indian Creek Special Recreation Management Area as parking turn-outs or to turn around. Foot travel would consist of walks on developed trails such as the Butler Wash Archeological Ruins Trail. Tours may be offered year-round and the number of tours offered each year will be demand-driven.

The tour leader will promote a Leave No Trace message, and will educate participants about proper site etiquette before and during the visit. The tours will make use of existing pit toilet facilities at developed sites, and no additional human waste disposal strategy is anticipated. The permit operator will have current First Aid and CPR certification. Communications will be available through cellular phones.

This operator is currently authorized to access areas within Arches and Canyonlands National Parks under permit CUA SEUG 5400 15-77.

B. Land Use Plan Conformance

Land Use Plan Name: Monticello Field Office Record of Decision and Approved Resource Management Plan

Date Approved/Amended: November 2008

The proposed action has been determined to be in conformance with the terms and conditions of the Monticello Resource Management Plan (October, 2008) as required by 43 CFR 1610.5.

Monticello's RMP states the following:

- CUL-3: The BLM will ensure that all authorizations for land and resource use will comply with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA), consistent with and subject to the objectives established in the RMP for the proactive use of cultural properties in the public interest.

- CUL-13: The BLM will work with local communities and other groups to foster heritage tourism throughout the Monticello PA.
- REC-17: SRPs will be issued as a discretionary action as a means to help meet management objectives, control visitor use, protect recreational and natural resources, and provide for the health and safety of visitors.
- REC-19: SRPs will be used to manage different types of recreation associated with commercial uses, competitive events, organized groups, vending, and special areas. These recreation uses can include, for example, large group events, river guide services, and commercial recreational activities.

C. Compliance with NEPA

The Proposed Action is categorically excluded from further documentation under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) in accordance with 516 DM 11.9, H.

“Recreation Management. Issuance of Special Recreation Permits for day use or overnight use up to 14 consecutive nights; that impacts no more than 3 staging area acres; and/or for recreational travel along roads, trails, or in areas authorized in a land use plan. This CX cannot be used for commercial boating permits along Wild and Scenic Rivers. This CX cannot be used for the establishment or issuance of Special Recreation Permits for “Special Area” management (43 CFR 2932.5).”

This categorical exclusion is appropriate in this situation because there are no extraordinary circumstances potentially having effects that may significantly affect the environment. The proposed action has been reviewed, and none of the extraordinary circumstances described in 43 CFR Part 46.215 apply.

D: Signature

Authorizing Official: _____ Date: _____
(Name) (Title)

Contact Person

For additional information concerning this CX review, contact:

Misti Haines
Recreation Permits Assistant
BLM Monticello Field Office
(435)587-1550

Categorical Exclusion Review Record

Resource	Yes/No*	Assigned Specialist Signature	Date
Air Quality	No	CGiffen	
Areas of Critical Environmental Concern	No	BQuigley	
Cultural Resources	No	DSimonis	
Environmental Justice	No	BQuigley	
Farm Lands (prime or unique)	No	JCarling	
Floodplains	No	JCarling	
Invasive Species/Noxious Weeds	No	JCarling	
Migratory Birds	No	MScott	
Native American Religious Concerns	No	DSimonis	
Threatened, Endangered, or Candidate Species	No	MScott	
Wastes (hazardous or solid)	No	JBrown	
Water Quality (drinking or ground)	No	MScott	
Wetlands / Riparian Zones	No	JCarling	
Wild and Scenic Rivers	No	BQuigley	
Wilderness	No	CWorth	
Other:	NA		

*Extraordinary Circumstances apply.

Environmental Coordinator _____

Date: _____

Exceptions to Categorical Exclusion Documentation

The action has been reviewed to determine if any of the extraordinary circumstances (43 CFR 46.215) apply. The project would:

Extraordinary Circumstances		
1. Have significant impacts on public health or safety.		
Yes	No ✓	Rationale: Issuing the SRP not have significant impacts on public health or safety. A very small “footprint” is associated with the tours.
2. Have significant impacts on such natural resources and unique geographic characteristics as historic or cultural resources; park, recreation or refuge lands; wilderness areas; wild or scenic rivers; national natural landmarks; sole or principal drinking water aquifers; prime farmlands; wetlands (Executive Order 11990); floodplains (Executive Order 11988); national monuments; migratory birds; and other ecologically significant or critical areas.		
Yes	No ✓	Rationale: Issuing the SRP will not have significant impacts on such resources. The permit will allow for visitation to cultural resources and recreation areas, but the terms of the permit fall well within acceptable use in those areas.
3. Have highly controversial environmental effects or involve unresolved conflicts concerning alternative uses of available resources [NEPA section 102 (2) (E)].		
Yes	No ✓	Rationale: There is no controversy concerning the proposed action.
4. Have highly uncertain and potentially significant environmental effects or involve unique or unknown environmental risks.		
Yes	No ✓	Rationale: There are no unique environmental risks or uncertain effects associated with this brief hike.
5. Establish a precedent for future action or represent a decision in principal about future actions with potentially significant environmental effects.		
Yes	No ✓	Rationale: The action does not establish any new precedents for future actions. Each SRP application is evaluated on individual merit. Issuance of SRPs is a discretionary action, and SRPs may be denied for a variety of reasons, including over-allocation of sensitive areas.
6. Have a direct relationship to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant environmental effects.		
Yes	No ✓	Rationale: There are no cumulative effects associated with this action.

7. Have significant impacts on properties listed, or eligible for listing, on the National Register of Historic Places as determined by the bureau.		
Yes	No ✓	Rationale: Issuing the SRP would not have significant impacts to any properties either listed or eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places (NHPA). The hike involves visiting NHPA listed and eligible sites, but those sites have been determined to be appropriate for public visitation by a qualified BLM archeologist. BLM has built infrastructure including trails, fences, and interpretive signs at these sites in order to facilitate appropriate visitation. In addition, the trip leader will teach LNT for archeological sites. By providing interpretation and education, the activity will promote site protection.
8. Have significant impacts on species listed, or proposed to be listed, on the List of Endangered or Threatened Species, or have significant impacts on designated Critical Habitat for these species.		
Yes	No ✓	Rationale: The proposed project has been reviewed and determined by BLM resource specialists not to have significant impacts on species listed, or proposed to be listed, on the List of Endangered or Threatened Species, or have significant impacts on designated Critical Habitat for these species. The permit holder will follow the stipulations set in the permit to protect these species and their associated habitat.
9. Violate a Federal law, or a State, local or tribal law or requirement imposed for the protection of the environment.		
Yes	No ✓	Rationale: The action does not violate any laws.
10. Have a disproportionately high and adverse effect on low income or minority populations (Executive Order 12898).		
Yes	No ✓	Rationale: There are no effects on low income or minority populations.
11. Limit access to and ceremonial use of Indian sacred sites on Federal lands by Indian religious practitioners or significantly adversely affect the physical integrity of such sacred sites (Executive Order 13007).		
Yes	No ✓	Rationale: Issuing the SRP will not limit access to ceremonial uses of sacred Indian sites, nor will it adversely affect the physical integrity of such sacred sites.
12. Contribute to the introduction, continued existence, or spread of noxious weeds or non-native invasive species known to occur in the area or actions that may promote the introduction, growth, or expansion of the range of such species (Federal Noxious Weed Control Act and Executive Order 13112).		
Yes	No ✓	Rationale: The activity would not introduce noxious weeds.